

## Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics &amp; Sociology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_127191
Title of the Manuscript:	A STUDY ON SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS OF CABBAGE GROWERS IN KRISHNAGIRI DISTRICT OF TAMIL NADU
Type of the Article	

### **General guidelines for the Peer Review process:**

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

### **Important Policies Regarding Peer Review**

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

## Review Form 3

### PART 1: Review Comments

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The introduction could benefit from a brief discussion of existing literature or research to highlight knowledge gaps that this study seeks to address. A clearer definition of "socio-economic status" and why it is significant in the context of rural development would strengthen the foundation of the study.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Title is suitable	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract doesn't clearly explain the research problem or the objectives of the study. It mentions "an attempt had been made to understand the reality of cabbage grower," but it doesn't specify what exactly the study aims to investigate about cabbage growers. The abstract mentions a sample size of 120, but does not explain how the sample was chosen or why this specific number was selected. It also briefly mentions data collection via "personal interview method" but does not give any context about how the interviews were structured or validated.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	A more detailed description of the "pre-tested structured interview schedule" would be useful, especially the type of questions asked and how they align with the research objectives. A brief mention of any ethical considerations (informed consent, confidentiality) would add consistency to the methodological approach.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The results are presented primarily in descriptive terms. Including some statistical tests (e.g., correlation or regression analysis) could provide a more in-depth understanding of the relationships between socio-economic factors and cabbage production.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	Ensure correct use of commas between authors' names and use "and" before the last author's name (in case of multiple authors). The names should be in the form: Last Name, Initial(s). If available, always include the DOI or a stable URL for the article. If a DOI is not available, a direct link to the journal article can be provided. Maintain a consistent style across all references, ensuring the format for authors, titles, publication years, journal names, volume, issue, and page numbers follows the same pattern.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language is clear, but there are some minor grammatical and typographical errors. For example, in the introduction, the phrase "whereas; farmers engaged" should be "whereas farmers engaged," and there are issues with punctuation and sentence structure in some sections	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

### PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Noluthabo Wawa
Department, University & Country	University of Limpopo, South Africa